

THE DECLARATION REJECTION

Enclosed with the current office action response are new declarations for each of the inventors, which comply with the wording, noted by the examiner.

THE DRAWINGS REJECTION

Enclosed with the current office action response are (1) amended drawings and (2) a marked up set of the amended drawings that correct the deficiencies noted by the examiner.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 23 has been amended to depend on amended claim 19. Claim 19 discloses an “at least one local sensor”, thereby giving claim 23 proper antecedent basis for the “said at least one local sensor”.

35 U.S.C. §112 REJECTION

Claim 20 has been amended such that the word “including” has been removed, and now the components are more clearly described as being “operationally coupled to said control assembly”. Claim 22 has been amended such that the “at least one local sensor” is no longer described as “comprising” the various components (such as the water heater leak sensor, etc) but rather, the various components are described as being part of the system and being “being “operationally coupled to said control assembly”. Claim 25 has been cancelled and rewritten as new claim 52. New claim 52 depends on claim 46. Claim 52 has enabling support at page 13, lines 1-5 of the original patent application and at original claim 25. However, now, there is antecedent basis for the modem. Claim 26 has been cancelled, and rewritten as new claim 53. Claim 53 has enabling support at page 13, lines 10-16 of the patent application, and original claim 26. The examiner refers to claim 26 as not enabling for a “motion detector means”, however claim 26 does not refer to a “motion detector means”. I believe that the examiner means claim 28, when she is referring to the “motion detector means”. Claim 28 has been amended to remove the “motion detection means” language. Claim 28 now discloses a “motion detector” which has enabling support at page 13, lines 17-24 of the patent application and original claim 28.

35 U.S.C. §102 REJECTION

Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations claim 1 and of allowable subject matter claim 4, and thus is now allowable.

35 U.S.C. §103 REJECTIONS

Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 1 and of allowable subject matter claim 4. Claim 2, 3, 5 and 6 now all ultimately depend on allowable claim 1.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations of claim 1 and of allowable subject matter claim 4, and thus is now allowable. Claim 19 has been rewritten as an independent claim including the limitations of claim 9 and allowable subject matter claim 19, and as such, claim 19 is now allowable. The examiner stated that independent claim 37 contains allowable subject matter. All claims now depend ultimately on allowable claims 1, 19, or 37, and should thus all be allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that claims as amended be allowed. On the basis of the above remarks, early consideration of this application and early allowance are respectfully requested.

By:



Michael A. Blake
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,333

Date: July 11, 2007

Law Office of Michael A. Blake
Registered Patent Attorney
112 Broad Street
Milford, CT 06460
(203)876-5081
(203)876-7195 fax
mblake@blake-ip.com